	Case 1:22-cv-01580-JLT-SAB D	Oocument 40	Filed 02/08/24	Page 1 of 2	
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10					
11	FREDERICK WAYNE SMITH,	Case 1	No. 1:22-cv-01580) JLT SAB (PC)	
12	Plaintiff,		ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, GRANTING		
13	v.	DEFE	DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND DISMISSING THE ACTION WITHOUT PREJUDICE		
14	KATHLEEN ALLISON, et al.,				
15	Defendants.	(Docs	. 28, 39)		
16					
17	Frederick Wayne Smith seeks to hold R. Rodriguez—the sole remaining defendant—liable				
18	for retaliation, deliberate indifference to safety, and denial of access to the courts. (See Doc. 16.)				
19	Defendant seeks summary judgment, asserting Plaintiff did not exhaust available administrative				
20	remedies. (Doc. 28.)				
21	The magistrate judge observed, "Defendant has submitted undisputed evidence that an				
22	administrative procedure process was available to Plaintiff." (Doc. 39 at 6.) The magistrate				
23	judge determined it was "undisputed that Plaintiff failed to put the institution or CDCR on				
24	notice that Plaintiff claimed retaliation, deliberate indifference, or denial of access to the courts				
25	by Defendant Rodriguez or anyone else." (<i>Id.</i> at 6-7.) Therefore, the magistrate judge found "Plaintiff failed to exhaust available administrative remadies available to him before filing his				
26	"Plaintiff failed to exhaust available administrative remedies available to him before filing his				
27	lawsuit." (<i>Id.</i> at 7.) The magistrate judge recommended the motion for summary judgment be granted, and the claims be dismissed without prejudice. (<i>Id.</i>)				
28	granted, and the claims be dismissed with	out prejudice.	(14.)		
	1				

Case 1:22-cv-01580-JLT-SAB Document 40 Filed 02/08/24 Page 2 of 2 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on all parties and notified Plaintiff 1 2 any objections were due within 14 days. (Doc. 39 at 7.) The Court advised him that the "failure 3 to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal." (Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file 4 5 objections, and the time to do so has passed. 6 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court performed a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations 8 are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**: 9 1. The Findings and Recommendations dated January 10, 2024 (Doc. 39) are 10 ADOPTED. 2. Defendants motion for summary judgment (Doc. 28) is **GRANTED**. 11 12 3. The action is **DISMISSED**, without prejudice, for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. 13 14 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. 15 T IS SO ORDERED. 16 Dated: February 8, 2024 17

Punifu [-] MWMM

26 27

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

28